Whether the judge can evaluate who is doing the better debating presumes equal ability to debate and gain access to the ballot. Some arguments make the round unsafe for debaters to voice arguments *– thus the prima facie role of the ballot is to maintain the safety of the debate space – it’s a voting issue since it’s a prerequisite to debate itself –* the judge cannot evaluate who is winning under a framework if you exclude others voices. **TEEHAN:[[1]](#footnote-1)** Honestly, I don't think that 99% of what has been said in this thread so far actually matters. It doesn't matter whether you think that these types of assumptions should be questioned. It doesn't matter what accepting this intuition could potentially do or not do. It doesn't matter if you see fit to make, incredibly trivializing and misplaced I might add, links between this and the Holocaust. All of the arguments that talk about how debate is a unique space for questioning assumptions make an assumption of safety. They say that this is a space where one is safe to question assumptions and try new perspectives. That is not true for everyone. When we allow arguments that question the wrongness of racism, sexism, homophobia, rape, lynching, etc., we make debate unsafe for certain people. The idea that debate is a safe space to question all assumptions is the definition of privilege, it begins with an idea of a debater that can question every assumption. People who face the actual effects of the aforementioned things cannot question those assumptions, and making debate a space built around the idea that they can is hostile. So, you really have a choice. Either 1) say that you do not want these people to debate so that you can let people question the wrongness of everything I listed before, 2) say that you care more about letting debaters question those things than making debate safe for everyone, or 3) make it so that saying things that make debate unsafe has actual repercussions. On "debate is not the real world". Only for people who can separate their existence in "the real world" from their existence in debate. That means privileged, white, heterosexual males like myself. I don't understand how you can make this sweeping claim when some people are clearly harmed by these arguments. At the end of the day, you have to figure out whether you care about debate being safe for everyone involved. I don't think anyone has contested that these arguments make debate unsafe for certain people. If you care at all about the people involved in debate then don't vote on these arguments. If you care about the safety and wellbeing of competitors, then don't vote on these arguments. If you don't, then I honestly don't understand why you give up your time to coach and/or judge. Th

Turns fairness – you exclude people by not taking account of their speaking position and assuming safety, but there is no prima facie equity in our ability to engage different arguments so it’s a prior question to all-else-considered fairness concerns.

Kantian philosophy is anti-gay - this is not an ad hominem - this is a conclusion of his ethics and the formula of humanity. **SOBLE[[2]](#footnote-2)** quotes Kant**:** Kant immediately continues by completing his sparse inventory of three objectionable, sexually unnatural, practices [quote begins here] “A second crimen carnis contra naturam is intercourse between sexus homogenii, in which the object of sexual impulse is a human being but there is homogeneity instead of heterogeneity of sex. . . . This practice too is contrary to the ends of humanity; for the end of humanity in respect of sexuality is to preserve the species without debasing the person; but in this instance the species is not being preserved (as it can be by a crimen carnis secundum naturam), but the person is set aside, the self is degraded below the level of the animals, and humanity is dishonoured. The third crimen carnis contra naturam occurs when the object of the desire is in fact of the opposite sex but is not human. Such is sodomy, or intercourse with animals. This, too, is contrary to the ends of humanity and against our natural instinct. It degrades mankind below the level of animals, for no animal turns in this way from its own species.75

This is not “Kant believed some other bad thing.” The argument follows from the necessity of avoiding contradiction in conception by willing the perpetuation of the species. Kant thought the homosexual maxim of sex without reproduction had no such function, so it constituted sacrificing your rational agency for the subordinate end of pleasure.

Means that gay people cannot operate under the assumptions of the 1ac - you have made the round unsafe for them by deploying philosophy that openly condones homophobia and thus attempts to exclude them from the discussion. Discussions in a classroom have profound impacts in academic settings. **SOBLE (2):** What was it like to listen to the distinguished Kant lecture on sexual perversion, to sit in Kant's classroom in 1780, hearing his emotional, weakly-argued condemnation of masturbation and homosexuality, and copying it into a notebook?96 Did his students titter? Was tittering tolerated in the German classroom? Did they at least roll their eyes? Were they disgusted, along with Kant, at homosexuality, or were they disgusted by his disgust? (Are my students disgusted, along with me, by homophobia, or are they disgusted by my being disgusted?) And those in his classes who masturbated or were homosexual, how did they respond? Consider the pain of hearing oneself accused in the strongest terms of being lower than a beast, and being accused by no less an authority than Professor Kant. His diatribe against homosexuality is little more than intellectual gay-bashing. Thus I imagine the profound fear felt by his targets who attended his lectures. I wonder if I would have had the courage to confront Kant in class, if I would have had the manly balls of my rational autonomy to do what the lesbian sadomasochist Pat Califia does: If I am going to be called all those bad names anyway, I might as well be the first one to spread the good news. When you come out, you make yourself vulnerable to disapproval, criticism, and discrimination. But you also get to define your own terms. You get to go first and be the one to say who you are and what that means. And after you've already admitted in public that you're a hopelessly twisted slut, what are your detractors going to do?97 I don't know if I would have been able to confess my own 'pervy' sexuality in Kant's auditorium. Maybe it is only from the comfortable, far away position of the early 21st-century that I feel safe calling Kant's account of sexual perversion a clunker concocted by a kisöreg.
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